DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 925 SO 011 301

TITLE	The National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities...And Equal Opportunity for Women.
INSTITUTION	Women's Equity Action League, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 78
NOTE	32p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Art; Awards; Citizen Participation; Civil Rights; Educational Finance; Educational Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Regulation; *Females; Feminism; Financial Support; Governance; *Humanities; Incentive Grants; *National Programs; Program Evaluation; *Sex Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS	National Endowment for the Arts; National Endowment for the Humanities

ABSTRACT

The document examines federal regulation of educational programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Specifically, the booklet explores discrimination against women by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). The document is presented in seven chapters. Chapter I discusses the relationship between Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and the NEH and NEA. Chapter II presents background information on the endowments and identifies problem areas in endowment policies toward women. Chapters III and IV provide more detailed information on goals, activities, and programs of the NEH and NEA and present figures on fellowship programs and recipients for each agency since 1971. Chapter V offers conclusions and recommendations. Conclusions are that the NEH and NEA should regulate participation in endowment programs and activities, grant funds only to institutions which comply with equal employment opportunity laws, and increase efforts to include women on review panels and as grant recipients. Recommendations include that the endowments should meet requirements of equal opportunity laws, encourage women applicants and panelists, and establish a task force to monitor potential discriminatory practices. Chapter VI consists of an appendix, followed by a bibliography in the final chapter. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162925

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A WEAL FUND REPORT

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS FOR THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES...AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith Wise

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

WEAL FUND
805 15th Street, NW
Suit 822
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/638-1961

SO-011301

WEAL FUND

Women's Equity Action League Educational and Legal Defense Fund is a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization whose goal is to secure legal and economic rights for women by carrying on educational and research projects in the area of sex discrimination, by monitoring the implementation and enforcement of civil rights and other laws, and by supporting law suits in the field of equal rights. To carry out its work, WEAL Fund solicits tax-deductible contributions from individuals and financial support from foundations, corporations, and governmental agencies. We have received donations from thousands of individuals and grants from The Ford Foundation; John D. Rockefeller, III; Weyerhaeuser Foundation; Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company; the U.S. Agency for International Development; the U.S. Department of State; and the U.S. Office of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research and writing of this paper were conducted under the auspices of the WEAL Fund Intern Program which is directed by Carol Parr and supported by a grant from The Ford Foundation. Lavinia Chase and Julie Zatz collected much of the data, with assistance from Gail Appleton, who drafted a preliminary version of the report. Maxine Forman, as consultant to this project, provided a thorough review, contributed additional data, and revised and rewrote substantial portions of the draft. Judith Sullivan prepared the paper for publication. The Ford Foundation neither endorses nor assumes responsibility for this publication.

August 1978

The National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities...and Equal Opportunity for Women

ERRATA SHEET

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS - (Inside Cover) Line 3 should read: "Lavinia Chase and Julie Zatz collected much of the data (with assistance from Gail Appleton) and drafted a preliminary version of the report."

P. 1 - line 1 should read "...the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities."

P. 2 - line 7 should read "...no such requirements for funding."

P. 3 - line 1 should read "...Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities..."

P. 3 - third paragraph, line 2: The word between is misspelled.

P. 6 - Chart A. Two programs have been omitted from the Division of Fellowships and Stipends: Summer Stipends and Summer Seminars for College Teachers.

P. 9 - line 12 should read "...not sufficiently qualified?"

P. 11 - second paragraph, line 1 should read "It is clear that for the year 1975 the fellowships most awarded to women are those aimed at..."

P. 14 - the heading should be Roman IV instead of VI.

P. 14 - second paragraph should read "These goals are carried out through the Endowment's twelve programs which give grants to groups and individuals."

P. 22 - line 1 should read "public access television," dropping the word to.

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS FOR THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES... AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN

This paper examines the role of women both as individual recipients of grants and fellowships, and as expert panelists in the review process which is central to the awarding of federal funds. It does not address the issues of women as employees of the Endowments, or as topics of sponsored projects and research. The following pages treat the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts as the two separate agencies which they are. Discussion of each is based on examination of documents and interviews with staff in 1977 and early 1978.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS FOR THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES: DOES TITLE IX APPLY?	1
II.	WHAT ARE THE ENDOWMENTS AND WHAT ARE WEAL FUND'S CONCERNS?	3
III.	THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES (NEH)	5
IV.	THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS (NEA)	14
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
VI.	APPENDIX	24
VII.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	25

I. THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS FOR THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES: DOES TITLE IX APPLY?

In July of 1977 the National Endowments of the Arts and the Humanities were the topic of a letter to WEAL Fund from the Office of the Secretary, Civil Rights Division, Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). The letter was in reply to the Fund's earlier correspondence calling attention to the failure of the Endowments to issue regulations implementing Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.[1] WEAL Fund's letter to HEW had been prompted by the conflicting views expressed in various interviews of Endowments officials:

- Congress had never meant Title IX to cover the Endowments;
- Section 902 of Title IX probably covered the Endowments, but guidance from HEW was needed before regulations could be written;
- Without orders from the "top", Endowments officials felt no urgency to issue the regulations directed by Section 902.

The HEW letter contained good, bad and confusing news. On the positive side, it stated that if the Endowments fund educational programs and activities, they are indeed required to issue Title IX regulations.[2] The bad news was that HEW claimed it had no authority to require issuance of these regulations. What was confusing, however, was HEW's apparent ignorance of the fact that the language of Sec. 902 of the statute "authorized and directed" the issuance of these regulations, so that the Endowments needed no further direction from HEW to do what was required by law.

---

[1] The relevant parts read:

> Sec. 901. (a) No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance...
>
> Sec. 902. Each federal department and agency which is empowered to extend federal financial assistance to any education program or activity, by way of grant, loan, or contract other than a contract of insurance or guaranty, is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of Section 901 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken...

[2] According to the National Endowments for the Humanities, over 100 colleges and universities were directly aided in improving instruction in the humanities during the year ending June 1975. Through the recent Educational Consultant program many more institutions have benefited.

Six months later (and six years after the passage of Title IX) WEAL Fund decided to find out if the Endowments had taken Title IX seriously. An examination of the 1977-78 program guides revealed mixed findings. The Arts guide states that in order to be eligible for funding, an organization must operate its programs without discrimination based on race, color, national origin or handicap; there is no mention of sex discrimination. The Humanities announcement, on the other hand, lists no requirements for funding. It does claim, however, that its own programs are "administered in harmony" with the goals of Title VI[3] and Title IX. Eager to discover the details of the Endowment's procedures to insure this harmony, we asked the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) General Counsel in a phone interview. He explained that there are no regulations, due to understaffing, and that the agency would get to them "when it could." He assured us, however, that all grants are open to both sexes and that organizations seeking funds are "made aware" of Title IX.

Title IX is not the only legislation that applies in regard to non-discriminatory funding by the Endowments. Also at issue are laws affecting equal employment opportunity and equal pay.[4] Ballet companies, symphony orchestras, museums and libraries are eligible for Endowments funding, but no procedures exist to refuse funds, for example, to symphony orchestras that discriminate against women instrumentalists or museums that discriminate against women in promotions or pay.

As long as the Endowments continue to support educational and cultural institutions, they must take responsibility for insuring that recipients of this federal support do not discriminate against women. It is time to get on with this task.

---

[3] Title VI prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race and national origin in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

[4] Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex, in any organization having 15 or more employees. The Equal Pay Act prohibits sex discrimination in salaries and most fringe benefits.

II. WHAT ARE THE ENDOWMENTS AND WHAT ARE WEAL FUND'S CONCERNS?

In 1965 the Foundation of the Arts and Humanities was established as an independent agency of the Executive Branch of the federal government. The National Foundation consists of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, two National Endowments -- the Arts (NEA) and the Humanities (NEH) -- and their respective advisory agencies, the National Council on the Arts and the National Council on the Humanities. The goals of the Endowments are to generate support for the arts and the humanities by working in partnership with states or by requiring matching funds for many of their grants. Since 1965, well over a billion dollars has been appropriated by Congress for Endowments grants to individuals and organizations. President Carter, in his proposed budget for fiscal year 1979, requested that funding for the Endowments be increased by over $50 million, the largest dollar increase in the history of these agencies.

In November and December of 1975, the Endowments were publicly taken to task for their policies on women at a meeting with the Arts and Humanities Committee of the International Women's Year Commission. The committee was well aware that the financial power and impressive stature of the Endowments made them important forces in the lives of women professionally involved in these fields. Therefore it focused its concern on the low percentage of women as Endowments grant applicants, recipients and panel members.[5]

Between 1973 and 1975, women received only 18% of all grants awarded by NEH. Bwtween 1971 and 1974, the highest percentage of women applicants in all NEH Fellowship programs was 19.8; the highest percentage of recipients was 22.6. Although women were 30% of all musicians, they received only 5% of all NEA music fellowships in fiscal year 1977.

Women as review panelists fare no better. In 1977, nine of the twelve NEA programs had panels with fewer than 25% women. During one six month period in 1975, the NEH active panelist and consultant list included only 13% women.[6] These statistics are puzzling since the fields supported by the Endowments include languages, literature, social sciences and the visual and performing arts, and these fields, according to the 1970 Census and recent NEA data, boast a substantial number of women. What's more, 33% of all doctorates in the humanities in 1975 were awarded to women, and 35% of all

---

[5] National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, The Creative Woman: A Report of the Committee on the Arts and Humanities. (Washington: National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1975) p. 31.

[6] NEA data was extracted from a memorandum by Robert Hartmann, Congressional Office, NEA, March 1977. NEH data was extracted from a report entitled "Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities to the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1975." No author listed.

college and university humanities teachers are women.[7] It is probably safe to say that the small percentage of recipients is a function of the small percentage of women applicants and possibly the low percentage of women panel members. There is reason to believe that at least part of the problem is the result of a traditional and informal recruitment method, "the old boy network," which provides information about opportunities primarily to men.

---

[7] National Research Council. Summary Report, 1975: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities. (Washington DC: National Academy of Sciences, May 1976).

III. THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES (NEH)

The National Endowment for the Humanities supports and strengthens research, education and public programs in the humanities. The humanities are broadly defined by statute to include the study of the following: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism, theory and practice of the arts; those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment with particular attention to the relevance of the current conditions of national life.[8]

The Endowment makes awards and administers most of its programs within four general divisions: Education, Fellowships and Stipends, Research Grants, and Public Programs. These support humanistic activities ranging from individual scholarly research to full scale collaborative efforts to produce research tools; from curriculum development and teacher enrichment programs to the development of media materials for the public. Chart "A" on page 6 describes these programs.

While all the divisions of NEH impact women either as professionals or as members of society, the Division of Fellowships is our focus because it receives more applications and makes more grants than any other. In 1975 these grants alone represented 45% of the total grants in all four divisions combined.[9] In addition, most fellowships are awarded to individuals employed by academic institutions and are therefore representative of major Endowment objectives: "The production of humanistic knowledge, and the development of the scholars and the teachers who produce that knowledge."[10] Those fellowship programs which especially address such objectives are: Fellowships for Independent Study and Research; Summer Seminars for College Teachers; Fellowships-in-Residence for College Teachers; and Summer Stipends. These programs are described on page 7 (Chart "B").

There is no doubt that scholars of the humanities have much to gain from these awards -- support for original research and writing, professional contacts, recognition and prestige.

As in most government funding processes the Endowment relies on the opinion of outside experts or panelists in order to verify whether the proposed study is useful and feasible. Recommendations are then made to the National Council on the Humanities which usually approves them and authorizes funding. According to the testimony presented by the Endowment to International Women's Year

---

[8] Public Law 89-209

[9] National Endowment for the Humanities, Eleventh Annual Report. (Washington DC: July 1977), p. 11.

[10] Ibid.

CHART "A"

DIVISION OR AREA	DESCRIPTION	PROGRAMS
Division of Research Grants	Strengthens scholarship in and provides support for new knowlege in the humanities by building up materials and resources needed for research. Projects are multi-year collaborative efforts.	• General research • Research materials • Research collections • Program development
Division of Fellowships and Stipends	Supports individuals in their studies as scholars, teachers and interpreters of the humanities by freeing their time for full time pursuit of their work for periods of one year or less.	• Independent study and research • Fellowships-in-Residence for college teachers • Fellowships and stipends in the professions • Fellowships in support of centers for advanced study
Division of Education Programs	Supports both innovative and traditional proposals to improve instruction in the humanities at all levels of learning.	• Institutional grants • Higher education projects • Elementary and secondary education • Cultural institutions
Division of Public Programs	Supports efforts to increase appreciation of the humanities within the adult non-student population through grants to the following: museums; libraries; historical organizations; radio, film and TV groups.	• Museums and historical organizations • Media • Program development
Office of State Programs*	Supports local humanities projects through grants to citizens committees in each state	Citizen-designed projects are supported by each state committee in response to priorities based on state resources and opportunities

* State based programs were formerly part of the Division of Public Programs. The information in the above NEH chart was adapted form the National Endowment for the Humanities Program Announcement 1977-78. Complete and detailed descriptions can be found in that guide to programs.

CHART "B"

DIVISION OR AREA	DESCRIPTION
Fellowships for Independent Study and Research	These carry a maximum stipend of $20,000 for up to 12 months of full-time study or research for those who have demonstrated or show promise of making a significant contribution to the body of humanistic knowledge.
Summer Seminars for College Teachers	These carry an award of $2,000 for undergraduate teachers at two and four year colleges to participate in small groups led by distinguished scholars in their fields.
Fellowships-in-Residence for College Teachers	These carry a maximum stipend of $14,500 for undergraduate teachers in two and four year colleges who are primarily concerned with increasing their own knowledge and understanding of the subjects which they teach. Each recipient engages in a special program of study at a designated university under the direct supervision of a distinguished scholar in the field.
Summer Stipends	These carry an award of $2,000 for two months of full-time study or research for college and university teachers and other humanists.

Committee mentioned previously, 86% of all NEH panelists are men, and in fiscal year 1975, the Fellowships Division, granting almost half of the awards in all divisions combined, relied on a panelist roster that was 85% male.[11]

Selection of NEH Experts

How is a person selected to be an NEH expert? According to the Endowment, the low percentage of women on college and university faculties directly affects the number of women serving on panels. This is because, in what is perilously close to an incestuous process, the Endowment finds its experts by asking for recommendations from universities and professional associations. Furthermore, those who have received Endowment support in the past are likely to be panelists in the future. The rationale is that those who previously have been awarded fellowships are the best judge of those seeking them. The result, of course, is perpetuation of traditional patterns of male dominance within the Endowment panel structure.

This male dominance mirrors that of academia. Rank, usually full professorship, seems to go hand in hand with panel membership, and full professorship is not easy for women to attain. In fact, according to a report by Roslyn D. Kane, the recent increase in the employment of women in academia has not been accompanied by a comparable increase in the promotion of academic women to advanced ranks. Men continue to be promoted to higher level tenured positions at a faster rate than women.[12] In 1974-75, four times as many men as women were promoted to the top rank, according to the WEAL Fund's "Facts About Women in Higher Education."

Publication record is another measure of prestige in academia, and is often equated with productivity. One study revealed that, although men had published more articles than women, data on books and monographs were inconclusive; only in history had men published more books than women.[13] Other studies emphasize sex differences in publication records and offer reasons why women do not publish as much as men: women are concentrated in lower academic ranks

---

[11] National Endowment for the Humanities, Tenth Annual Report. (Washington DC: 1976), pp. 67-73.

[12] Roslyn D. Kane, Sex Discrimination in Education, a Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel. Vol. I: Study Report. (Washington DC: NCES, HEW, April 1976), p. VII-8.

[13] Rita James Simon, and Evelyn Rosenthal, "Profile of the Women PhD in Economics, History, and Sociology," Journal of the American Association of University Women, Vol. 60, No. 3, March 1967, pp. 127-29, cited in Roslyn D. Kane, Sex Discrimination in Education, A Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel. Vol. I: Study Report. (Washington DC: NCES, HEW April 1976), p. VII-8.

where teaching loads are heaviest; women are less likely to be assigned graduate student assistance; women are less likely to be invited to serve as editors or to write book reviews and articles, or be members of professional panels or high ranking research teams. In short, women's opportunities to attain impressive publication or productivity records are limited.[14]

In its 1975 testimony to the International Women's Year (IWY) committee, the Endowment pointed to statistics in order to explain or even excuse its record in regard to women as participants in Endowment activities. In essence, it pointed to the small percentage of women in all full-time faculty positions (24%) and the even smaller percentage of women as full professors (10%).[15] In such a situation, how could the Endowment be held responsible for the fact that women were not qualified sufficiently? There are two responses to that question.

First, the percentage of women on humanities faculties is somewhat higher than the percentage of women on faculties in general across the nation. A 1976 report by the Modern Language Association reveals that women comprised 32% of full-time modern language faculties in 1972-73, and the 1970 Census indicates that women were 35% of all college and university humanities faculties. These figures suggest that the percentage of women who could probably qualify to serve on panels is far greater than the 14% that the Endowment consistently utilizes.

Second, the concept of rank should be explored to determine whether it is a true indicator of competence as a panelist. The following table shows the type of appointment by rank and sex for faculty in modern language depart-

---

[14] Harriet N. Mischel, "Sex Bias in the Evaluation of Professional Achievements," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol 66, No. 2, April 1974, cited in Roslyn D. Kane, Sex Discrimination in Education, a Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel. Vol. I: Study Report (Washington DC: NCES, HEW April 1976), p. VII -2.

[15] Patricia A. Graham, "Women in Academe, " Science. Vol. 169, No. 3952, September 25, 1970, cited in Roslyn D. Kane, Sex Discrimination in Education, a Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel. Vol. I: Study Report (Washington DC: NCES, HEW April 1976), p. VII-2.

[16] National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, The Creative Woman: p. 31.

ments in 1972-73 in percentage points.[16]

ACADEMIC RANK	WOMEN	MEN	TOTAL
Professor	19	81	100
Associate Professor	29	71	100
Assistant Professor	31	69	100
Instructor/ Lecturer	49	51	100
Totals	32	68	100

It is clear that in the upper ranks, women are more likely to be associate professors, and in the lower ranks they are more likely to be instructors than assistant professors. There is no objective evidence that high academic rank is an indicator of competence in a panelist. In fact, the Endowment, in utilizing full professors almost exclusively on their review panels, is probably depriving itself of a rich resource of potential experts. In addition, in a setting where extra academic activities such as panel participation are weighed in decisions regarding tenure and promotion, it would make sense to give women faculty opportunities to perform such service. This would obviously place responsibility on the Endowment to include more associate professors and junior faculty on panels. Such an affirmative step need not compromise the quality of the panels and would contribute positively to the status of women in academia.

Women as NEH Fellowship Winners

Like the Endowment's review process, its application process suffers from a pattern that tends to exclude women. To make matters worse, administrative procedures are not geared to monitoring the situation. Applications for grant support are treated on a gender-blind basis in the interest of equality of opportunity. Once the grant recipients are chosen, however, their names but not their sex are kept on file, and no attempt is made to determine the extent of participation by each sex. It was with special effort, therefore, that the Endowment supplied the following statistics on the percentage of women applicants and recipients within all the programs of the Fellowship division.

---

16 Modern Language Association, Study III, Women in Modern Language Departments, 1972-73: A Report by the Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession. (New York: MLA, 1976), p.3.

DATE	PERCENTAGE OF APPLICANTS	PERCENTAGE OF RECIPIENTS
1971-72	14.7	14.1
1972-73	15.7	18.7
1973-74	15.6	14.8
1974-75	19.8	22.6

On the basis of these figures, the Endowment argued that within the Division of Fellowships, women enjoy a slightly higher ratio of success than men, even though a relatively small percentage of women apply. A close examination of other figures reveals that women do not fare as well in the most lucrative program, Independent Study and Research, as in the other three programs. Indeed, the more lucrative the program, the lower the percentage of women.

FIELD	TOTAL	WOMEN	% OF WOMEN TO TOTAL
Independent Study and Research (up to $20,000)	2486 applicants 151 recipients	460 applicants 19 recipients	18% 13%
Fellowships-in-Residence for College Teachers (up to $14,500)	661 applicants 141 recipients	146 applicants 31 recipients	22% 22%
Summer Stipends ($2,000)	1150 applicants 201 recipients	252 applicants 57 recipients	22% 28%
Summer Seminars 1977[17] ($2,000)	4137 applicants 1259 recipients	925 applicants 298 recipients	22% 24%

It is clear that the fellowships most awarded to women are the three aimed at improving teaching skills. This may reflect the fact noted earlier that women are at the lower academic levels, carry the heaviest teaching loads and are more often employed by smaller teaching colleges than by prestigious research oriented institutions. Independent Study and Research Fellowships, on the other hand, are usually awarded to well-published scholars of a senior rank who often do the least teaching but enjoy the most status and prestige.

We must also note that, although women were 23% of the 1975 participants in Summer Seminars, they comprised only 5% of Seminar leaders. Again, the criterion for selection is to be an "acknowledged expert" in the field. This imbalance clearly points up the need to redefine concepts such as "acknowledged expert."

---

[17] Until 1977, NEH Statistical reporting for Summer Seminars did not record the number of women as applicants and recipients.

Without a doubt, the status of women at NEH for the most part mirrors that of women in academia simply because most of those who receive Endowment support or who serve as panelists have academic affiliations. As they fit into the academic community, so do they fit into the National Endowment for the Humanities. In fact, the Independent Study and Research Fellowship program presently bases its award amounts on the current salary of the recipient[18] despite the fact that in 1975 the Endowment agreed to stop this particular practice because of its negative impact on women.[19] Despite legislation, the gap between salaries of male and female faculty members at all ranks remains. Six years ago, Astin and Bayer reported that women full professors made an average of $1700 less then their male counterparts.[20] That gap widened last year to $2,316 and this year to $2,461, according to 1977-78 salary figures from HEW.

MEAN SALARIES OF FULL-TIME FACULTY 1977-78[21]

RANK	MEN	WOMEN	GAP
All Ranks	19,316	15,941	3,375
Professor	24,965	22,504	2,461
Associate Professor	18,863	17,973	890
Assistant Professor	15,552	14,929	623
Instructor	13,150	12,323	827
Lecturer	14,513	12,898	1,615
Undesignated Rank	18,493	16,643	1,850

In 1975, the Endowment position had not been optimistic regarding its role in providing equal opportunity for women. During the 1975 IWY testimony, an Endowment representative spoke of "serious obstacles" to making any substantial impact upon women and pointed out that its funds may, in fact, serve, but not change, a long history of inequity for women.[22]

---

18 Interview with Director, Division of Fellowships, January 1978.

19 National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, The Creative Woman, p. 32.

20 Alan E. Bayer and Helen S. Astin, "Progress in the Elimination of Sex Discrimination in Academe: Have Antibias Regulations and 'Good Faith' Helped?" Unpublished paper. Shorter version appeared as "Sex Differentials in the Academic Reward System" in Science, Vol. 188 (May 19[illegible]), pp. 796-802.

21 Salary figures from National Center for Education Statistics. Chart by Char Mollison, WEAL Fund.

22 National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, The Creative Woman, p. 31.

"Serious obstacles" can be overcome, however, and a good beginning would be a refusal to accept the status quo. If, as the Endowment representatives claim, the percentage of women fellowship recipients reflects the percentage of women applicants, the Endowment should simply focus its efforts on increasing the percentage of applicants, since that figure is far below what it should be. As mentioned earlier, given the fact that 33% of all doctorates in the humanities in 1975 were awarded to women, and that 35% of all college and university humanities teachers are women, it should not be a difficult task to increase the percentage of applicants to almost 35%. Furthermore, by actively recruiting women applicants, the Endowment would be increasing not only the number of women recipients, but also the number of women considered worthy to be panelists.

A simple way to monitor the situation might be to keep applicant and panelist files, not only according to program and field of expertise, but also according to sex. It would be relatively easy to keep track of the status of women, both as applicants and panelists, and encourage qualified women to fill either category as imbalances become evident. Even this small effort would begin to invite women into all stages of the NEH application and review process.

VI. THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

The National Endowment for the Arts has three main goals:

- Availability of the arts: to promote the broad dissemination of cultural resources of the highest quality throughout the land;
- Cultural resources development: to assist our cultural institutions to provide greater public service and to improve artistic and administrative standards;
- Advancement of our cultural legacy: to support creativity among our most gifted artists, encourage the preservation of our cultural heritage, and advance the quality of life of our nation.[23]

These goals are carried out through the Endowments twelve programs which gives grants to groups and individuals. Most of the programs focus on the traditional fields of art such as dance, music, visual arts, literature and media; a smaller number concentrate on developing new areas of expression and appreciation. The aim is to support the professional development of the artists as well as to increase the pleasure of audiences throughout the nation. Chart "C" on pages 15-17 describes the programs and lists the grant categories of the Endowment.

The proposed National Plan of Action for the 1977 National Women's Conference in Houston reveals that women artists, teachers, or administrators of arts institutions receive less recognition and support than men in the field. In 1972 women comprised only 20% of the artists exhibiting in the top 100 galleries in New York City. Male artists receive about three times more space in art reviews than women artists. Although 50% of professional artists in the U.S. are women, only one percent of museum exhibitions are by living women. In every part of the art profession, according to a 1970 census, women earn less than men. According to the Plan, Museums, USA (1974) revealed that women held only 38% of the senior posts in American museums and earned half the average salary of men.[24] This is the status of women in the arts. How do they fare as fellowship recipients and consultants in the National Endowment for the Arts?

Selection of NEA Experts

Applicants for individual grants within each program are considered by a panel of experts or consultants. For some programs there is only one panel -- consisting of 13-19 members; for others, there are smaller specialized panels --

---

[23] National Endowment for the Arts: Guide to Programs, 1977-78, p. 2.

[24] National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. Proposed National Plan of Action (Washington DC: Department of State, 1977), p. 1.

The National Plan of Action, adopted by the conference in November 1977, includes recommendations on the arts and humanities. These appear in the appendix.

CHART "C"

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	CATEGORIES FOR FUNDING
Architectural and Environmental Arts	Encourages creativity and makes the public aware of the benefits of good design through funding activities relating to architecture, urban design, city and regional planning, fashion design, and other recognized design professions.	• Grants to Individuals Professional Fellowships in Design Design Project Fellowships • Grants to Organizations Livable Cities Design and Communication Cultural Facilities Research and Design • General Programs
Dance	Supports efforts to make professional performances available to large audiences and assists other activities relating to the growth of dance as a performing art.	• Dance Touring • Choreography Fellowships and Production (five categories) • Resident Professional Dance Companies • Long-term Dance Companies • Management and Administration • Services to the Field • Dance/Film/Video • General Programs
Literature	Provides assistance to creative writers and encourages greater audiences for their works.	• Assistance to Small Presses • Residences for Writers • Assistance to Literary Magazines • Fellowships for Creative Writers • Services to the Field
Music	Supports excellence in all areas of music performance and creativity through aid to groups and individuals.	• Fellowships for Composers and Librettists (3 categories) • Jazz/Folk/Ethnic Music (3 categories) • Independent Schools of Music • Opera • Orchestra • Music Resources Projects

CHART "C" (cont'd)

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	CATEGORIES FOR FUNDING
Theatre	Supports and stimulates creative activity in the theatre arts and attempts to raise artistic standards through grants to various theatre efforts.	• Professional Theatre Companies • Professional Theatre Companies with Short Seasons • Small Theatre Companies: Developmental, Alternative Theatres • Theatre for Youth • State Arts Agencies - Theatre Projects • Services to the Field • General Programs • Professional Theatre Training
Visual Arts	Aids individual artists and art critics through fellowships and aids the various fields through assistance to workshops, exhibitions, surveys and publications.	• Painting, Sculpture and Printmaking • Photography • Crafts • Works of Art in Public Places • General Programs (including Art Critics Fellowships and Visual Artists and Critics in Residence)
Media Arts: Film/Radio/ Television*	Encourages the development of film, radio and television as art forms and as transmitters of other art forms.	• Regional Development • Fellowships for Filmmakers and Video Artists • Film Archival Programs • Services to the Field • General Programs
Education	Provides opportunities for students and teachers to become involved with the arts by working with professional artists either in the classroom or in community projects.	• Learning Through the Arts • Artists in Schools • Arts Administration

* Media Arts is referred to as Public Media in chart on p.18 .

CHART "C" (cont'd)

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	CATEGORIES FOR FUNDING
Office of Special Projects	Supports a wide variety of on-going inter-disciplinary activities and explores new program possibilities such as Folk Arts, which became a formal program in 1975.	• Folk Arts • Services to the Field • Art Centers and Festivals • "City Spirit" • United States/United Kingdom Bicentennial Exchange Fellowships
Expansion Arts	Assists, through matching grants, rural, suburban and urban community-based programs in the cultural expression of diversity through the arts.	• Operating Community Arts Program Development • Community Institutions
Federal/ State Partnership Program	Strengthens and develops state regional and community arts programming through grants to state arts agencies.	• Basic State Agency Grant • Community Development • Program Development • Regional Programs • Services to the Field

The information in the above NEA charts was adapted from the National Endowment for the Arts Program Announcement 1977-78. Complete and detailed descriptions can be found in that guide to programs.

from 3-9 members. Recommendations of the panel are then forwarded to the National Council on the Arts, which makes its own recommendations, and passes these on to the Chair, who makes the final award decision. The panels, which are extremely significant in the review process, make judgments without objective criteria. "Quality" is the standard. Program directors say that a variety of differing viewpoints among panelists results in a "fair" and "objective" appraisal.

The make-up of the panel is, therefore, extremely important. The selection process requires that the program staff and the council submit names to the Chair who then appoints the panel. Similar to the process at NEH, there is no formal procedure for soliciting or evaluating credentials of nominees. Informal contacts with "leaders in the field" are supposed to supply the Endowment with panelists who are "professionals in the field known for their expertise." Former grantees are considered for appointment because their names are familiar to the Endowment staff. As a member of the program staff explained, the prominence of panelists enhances the prominence of the National Endowment for the Arts.[25]

This informal method of selection may be expedient for the Endowment, but it serves as a barrier to the full participation of women in the grant making process. The percentage of women on these panels in 1977 indicates that they are poorly represented on many of them.

PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN ON NEA PANELS

PROGRAM	TOTAL	WOMEN	PERCENTAGE
Architecture and Environmental Arts	52	9	17.3
Dance	20	8	40.0
Education: Artists-in-Schools	18	7	41.2
Expansion Arts	15	6	40.0
Folk Arts	6	1	16.7
Literature	15	2	13.3
Museums	20	3	15.0
Music	91	21	23.1
Public Media	13	3	23.1
Special Projects	9	1	11.1
Theatre	18	3	16.7
Visual Arts	61	17	27.9
TOTAL	338	81	23.9

[25] Quotations are taken from interviews with NEA staff in 1977.

Six of the twelve programs used panels with fewer than 20% women, and the average percentage of women on all these panels was 24%, a figure lower than the percentage of women in the total arts population, 36%. The 1977 literature panel included only 13% women, a figure far below the percentage of women authors in the field, 39%. Similarly, women were 80% of all dancers, but only 40% of the dance panel.[26]

Many reasons are commonly offered to explain the paucity of women on panels. One official lamented that his program had done its best to find women experts, explaining that panel membership involved both an enormous amount of work and a big time commitment, and would be especially burdensome and inconvenient to women. In our view, since all panelists receive an honorarium, travel and living expenses, and most important, recognition and prestige, the advantages and disadvantages of serving probably affect both sexes similarly. In assembling NEA panels, it is considered important to reflect geographic diversity, ethnic and racial representation and a balance between practicing artists and members of the public. This same concern for balanced representation has not been extended to include women panelists, at least in proportion to their representation in a particular field. And although program directors feel they do their best to include women as panelists, their informal search procedures will not provide women with equal opportunity to serve on these prestigious panels.

Women as NEA Fellowship Winners

Recent statistics on women as applicants and recipients of NEA fellowships reveal that although women are represented in proportion to their participation in a few fields, there are a number of exceptions. In 1975 women comprised 18% of all architects and designers, yet for fiscal years 1976 and 1977 combined, not one woman won a Design Fellowship, although nine women applied. Women are 30% of all musicians and composers, yet they are underrepresented both as applicants and recipients in music fellowships. In the Jazz/Folk/Ethnic category, for fiscal year 1976 and 1977 combined, women were only 4% of applicants and 5% of recipients. As Composer/Librettists they were only 15% of the applicants and 12% of the recipients. In the field of Dance, where women might be expected to take most of the awards, they received only 56% of the fellowships while they comprise 80% of the field.[27] Clearly, the Endowment needs to carefully examine all programs to assure that women are participating in numbers reflecting their involvement in the field.

---

[26] Data obtained from Research Department, National Endowment for the Arts, January 1977.

[27] Data was obtained from program offices and from memorandum prepared by R. Hartmann, NEA Congressional office.

Most program staff interviewed believe that the Endowment demonstrates its sensitivity to women by its fairness to women applicants. In general, recruitment is done through established institutions such as art organizations, professional associations and universities. Staff do not see the need to make Endowment offerings known to potential applicants without such affiliations. In fact, some staff argue that little or no recruitment is necessary because the Endowment is well known and needs no publicity. In general, the feeling is that "it could be worse," and that its activities are simply responsive to the situation as it exists. The view is shared that the selection of recipients, like the selection of panelists, reflects the fact that women out there are not qualified. (NEH had the same view.) Furthermore, everyone interviewed named "tradition" as the culprit, for some programs are more open to women because those fields are, by tradition, more open to women. The fact that other programs are not that accessible to women is not viewed as the Endowment's problem. In addition, many see the problem originating in the women themselves. They do not make themselves known as potential panel members; they do not apply for grants, etc.

To the extent that this is true, it is a problem that demands the attention of the Endowment. Women's caucuses of professional associations, women's art groups and collectives and invididual artists need to hear about the opportunities offered by the Endowment. In the absence of an active and creative recruitment process to attract women as panelists and applicants, the Endowment is perpetuating a male-dominated "closed shop" which relies on word of mouth to fulfill its mandate.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

- Five years after the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities have not yet issued the regulations for these agencies which are required by law.

- No procedures exist to insure that funds are granted only to those cultural institutions that are in compliance with equal employment opportunity laws.

- Women are underrepresented both as award recipients and as panelists in the review process, and there is no apparent effort on the part of officials of the Endowments to counteract the word of mouth recruitment process which tends to favor males.

- The National Endowment for the Humanities reflects the discriminatory patterns with regard to sex that exist in the academic community.

Recommendations

Title IX and Equal Opportunity Laws

- The National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities should issue Title IX regulations at once to insure that federal financial assistance to educational programs or activities meets the requirements of the law.

- Until such time that Endowments issue Title IX regulations, they should notify all presently funded as well as applicant institutions of their policy regarding Title IX. In addition, the Endowments should require those institutions who have not already done so, to conduct self-evaluations and submit Title IX assurances. Institutions which do not submit assurances should be refused funds.

- The Endowments should establish procedures to insure that all cultural institutions seeking funds do not discriminate on the basis of sex in employment.

Women as Applicants and Recipients in the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities

- Endowments should develop extensive outreach programs designed to inform and attract female applicants. New sources for reaching women might include: sponsoring community workshops and seminars to advertise programs and explain application procedures: using

public access to television; sending representatives and/or materials to regional craft fairs, music festivals and professional conventions; publicizing in campus newspapers, alumnae magazines, newsletters of women's organizations and journals of the arts and the humanities; developing and using a roster of women's caucuses and collectives, as well as contacting individual members of such groups. All literature should contain a statement encouraging women and minorities to apply.

- NEH stipends or monetary awards should be standardized. This would end the disparate effect on women recipients which results from salary differentials between the sexes at all ranks in academia.

Women as Panelists in the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities

- The Endowments should cultivate new sources for potential panelists so that the percentage of women working as writers, musicians, historians, etc., is reflected in the percentage of women on the panel appropriate to each field. Increasing the number of women panelists may encourage more women to apply to the Endowments for support and will clearly increase the recognition given to successful women artists and scholars in the humanities. New sources for reaching women might include: publicizing opportunities for panel membership at professional conferences and in alumnae magazines, newsletters of women's organizations and caucuses, professional journals, and journals of the arts and the humanities; developing and using a roster of successful women artists, writers, musicians and scholars in the humanities. All literature should contain a statement encouraging women and minorities to apply.

- The concept of rank should be scrutinized in order to ascertain whether full professorship and competency as an NEH panelist are positively correlated. The Endowment should develop procedures for panel selection which take into account discrimination women experience in academia, such as difficulty in attaining rank.

Establishment of a Special Office to Monitor the Implementation of Title IX and Other Activities Regarding Non-Discriminatory Practices

- Within each Endowment a special office should be established with its own budget and staff to be responsible for the implementation of Title IX both in letter and in spirit. The principal functions of each office should be as follows:

  a) To insure that educational programs or institutions seeking funding comply with regulations promulgated by the Endowments.

  b) To insure that cultural organizations or institutions seeking funding comply with equal employment opportunity laws.

c) To compile data by sex within race in order to determine the numbers of women working in each field of the arts and the humanities. These numbers should be used to determine minimum levels of female participation.

d) To keep records by sex within race and to publish an annual report on the status of women applicants and recipients on a program by program basis. Individual applications should still be reviewed on a "blind" basis to preserve the fairness of the selection process.

e) To actively recruit women as applicants and panelists, and to maintain lists to be used by programs or divisions whose panels do not reflect the percentage of women working in the field. Sources for names would include convention and exhibit rosters and journal indices.

f) To maintain a list of staff outreach efforts undertaken to recruit women as applicants and panelists.

WEAL Fund is aware that the establishment of a special office in each Endowment will mean an increased expense. It is an essential expense, however, if the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities are to disburse federal funds in a non-discriminatory manner.

NATIONAL PLAN OF ACTION*

adopted
at
National Women's Conference
November 18-21, 1977
Houston, Texas

Arts and Humanities

The President should take steps to require that women:

- Are assured equal opportunities for appointment to managerial and upper level posts in Federally-funded cultural institutions, such as libraries, museums, universities and public radio and TV.
- Are more equitably represented on grant-awarding boards, commissions and panels.
- Benefit more fairly from government grants, whether as individual grant applicants or as members of cultural institutions receiving Federal or State funding.

Judging agencies and review boards should use blind judging for musicians, including singers, in appraising them for employment, awards, and fellowships as well as for all articles and papers being considered for publication or delivery and for all exhibits and grant applications, wherever possible.

* The National Plan of Action constitutes the official recommendations of the National Women's Conference, pursuant to Public Law 94-167.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women, On Campus With Women, Number 17. Washington DC: AAC, June 1977.

Astin, Helen S. and Bayer, Alan E., "Progress in the Elimination of Sex Discrimination in Academe: Have Antibias Regulations and 'Good Faith' Helped?" Unpublished paper. Shorter version appeared as "Sex Differentials in the Academic Reward System," in Science, Vol. 188 (May 1975), pp. 796-802.

Hamlin, Albert T., Assistant General Counsel, Civil Rights Division, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to Julie Zatz, Women's Equity Action League Educational and Legal Defense Fund; Washington DC, Letter, July 6, 1977.

Hartmann, Robert, Congressional Office, National Endowment for the Arts, to Ann Murphy. Memorandum Re: Women in Art/Grants to Women, March 14, 1977.

"International Women's Year Group Criticizes Endowment Agency," Washington Star, December 1975

Kane, Roslyn D. Sex Discrimination in Education: A Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel, Volume I, Study Report and Volume II, Annotated Bibliography, contract no. 300-75-0205. Washington DC: NCES, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, April 1976.

Modern Language Association. Study III, Women in Modern Language Departments, 1972-73: A Report by the Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession. New York: MLA, 1976.

National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. The Creative Woman: A Report of the Committee on the Arts and Humanities. Washington DC: National Commission on the Observance of IWY, 1975.

_____. Proposed National Plan of Action. Washington DC: Department of State, 1977.

_____. National Plan of Action. Washington DC: IWY Commission, 1977.

National Endowment for the Arts. 1976 Annual Report. Washington DC: NEA, April 1976.

_____. Guide to Programs, 1977-1978. Washington DC: NEA, 1977.

_____. Employment and Unemployment of Artists: 1970-1975. Washington DC: NEA, April 1976.

_____. Table #3 "Labor Force for Selected Occupations, 1971 and 1977." Table #9 "Total Labor Force and Unemployment for Selected Artistic Occupations and Sex: 1976." Unpublished.

National Endowment for the Humanities, Program Announcement, 1977-1978. Washington DC: NEH, 1977.

_____. Eleventh Annual Report. Washington DC: NEH, July 1977.

National Research Council. Summary Report 1975: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, May 1976.

Nies, Judith. Women and Fellowships. Washington DC: Women's Equity Action League Educational and Legal Defense Fund. Washington DC: April 1976.

"Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities to the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1975." (Typewritten)

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. 1975 Handbook on Women Workers. Washington DC: 1975.

Women's Equity Action League Educational and Legal Defense Fund. Facts About Women in Higher Education. Washington: July 1977.

_____. Women Graduates: A Statistical Survey of the Proportion of Women Earning Degrees in Higher Education in the U.S. Washington: August 1975.

Westervelt, Esther Manning. Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education: A Review of Research and Commentary as of 1973-74. Washington DC: NCES, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977.